

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-35 have been rejected. Claims 1-3, 10-12, 29-30 and have been amended. Claims 14-28 and 31 have been canceled. Claims 36-50 are new.

I. Summary of Telephonic Interviews

The Examiner is hereby acknowledged and thanked for the courtesy extended during the telephonic interviews of January 28 and February 2 between Examiner Huynh and the undersigned attorney. The pending claims, current Final Office Action and prior art were all discussed during this telephonic interview. Agreement was not reached with respect to many claims and claim elements, as well as that which is clearly taught by the primary prior art reference used, U.S. Patent No. 5,741,183 to Acres et al. ("Acres"). An invitation was made to amend the claims, which has been done herein. As noted below, Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue the prior claims in this or future continuing applications.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 10-23, 25 and 27-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,741,183 to Acres et al. ("Acres"). Applicants again respectfully traverse these § 102 rejections.

In order to anticipate a claim, a reference must include every material element of that claim. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

- 1) "at least one standard receptor slot for securing at least one other component to the main communication board,"
- 2) a "daughter board configured to plug into the receptor slot of the main communication board,"
- 3) wherein the daughter board is configured to "receive power from the main communication board," and wherein
- 4) "said daughter board compris[es] conversion circuitry for converting signals between the first communication format and a second communication format."

As set forth above, the Office Action rejects claim 1 as being anticipated by Acres, thereby taking the position that Acres contains every material element of claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Acres has not been shown to contain every material element of claim 1, however, and in particular has not been shown to contain any of the four specific elements listed above, each of which is required for a proper finding of anticipation.

As also noted in the previously filed paper "Amendment B" of August 7, 2003, Applicants point to various claim elements from other claims that are similarly not clearly disclosed by Acres, including:

- "a daughter board" having "a standard connector for plugging into a standard receptor slot of a main communication board on the gaming machine,"
- "conversion circuitry for converting signals from said first communication format to said second communication format,"
- the step of "replacing the first daughter board with [another] daughter board in the first standard receptor slot of the main communication board,"
- that the "[other] daughter board converts signals . . . to signals in a communications format, other than the first communication format,"
- yet an additional "[other] daughter board" in a "second standard receptor slot of the main communication board," and
- that this additional "[other] daughter board converts signals in a first communications format from the master gaming controller to signals in a third communications format."

In traversing the § 102 final rejections of all pending claims, Applicants respectfully reiterate and incorporate by reference in their entirety the additional remarks made in the previously filed paper of August 7, 2003. In the interests of furthering and expediting prosecution at this time, however, Applicants have accepted the invitation of the Examiner to further amend all claims, which amendments have been made herein. In so doing, Applicants do not intend to abandon the broader claims to which agreement could not be reached, but rather expressly reserve the right to pursue these broader claims further in this or one or more continuing applications.

As amended, independent claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*:

“... at least one primary power connection adapted to supply power to the main communication board [and] at least one secondary power connection adapted to supply power to at least one other component connected to the main communication board, wherein said at least one secondary power connection is adapted to have power supplied therethrough switched off while power is maintained through said at least one primary power connection. . .”

Similarly, independent claim 29 now recites, *inter alia*, “switching off power through said secondary power connection while power is maintained through said primary power connection,” while independent claim 30 now recites, *inter alia*, “switching off power through said first power connection while power is maintained through said second power connection.” In addition, new independent claim 49 recites, *inter alia*, “switching off power through said first power connection to said main communication board; and maintaining power to said first daughter board via said second power connection during said step of switching off power through said first power connection to said main communication board.”

Applicants respectfully submit that none of these recited elements are shown or suggested by Acres, such that Acres cannot be said to anticipate any of these independent claims for at least this additional reason. Because each of dependent claims 2-7, 10-13, and 32-35 depend from one of independent claims 1 or 30, these claims are likewise not anticipated by Acres for at least the same reasons as provided for these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the § 102 rejections with respect to claims 1-7, 10-13, 29-30 and 31-35.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acres alone. Although not explicitly stated in the Office Action, Applicants also understand claims 9 and 26 to also be rejected as being unpatentable over Acres alone. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and in so doing again reiterate and incorporate by reference the remarks made in the previous response of August 7, 2003.

IV. New Claims


Claims 36-50 are new. Support for each of these new claims can be found throughout the specification as filed, and particularly at pages 21-23 and FIG. 5. Claims 36-43 depend from independent claim 30, while claims 44-48 depend from independent claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are patentable over the prior art for at least the same reasons given for claims 1 and 30. New independent claim 49, from which claim 50 depends, is also patentable over the prior art, as discussed above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in proper form and condition for patentability, and request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. Outside the fee for the filing of an RCE is believed that no other fee is due at this time. Should any other fee be required for any reason related to this paper or application, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0388, referencing Docket No. IGT1P022. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below with any questions or concerns relating to this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Date: February 4, 2004



Justin A. White, Esq.
Reg. No. 48,883

Beyer, Weaver & Thomas LLP
P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, California 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300